

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the final Office communication dated February 4, 2008.

Summary

The specification is amended.

Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 8, 15 – 22, and 24 – 29 are currently pending.

Summary of Substance of Interview

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview with Applicant's Agent, Jay Knobloch, on 18 March 2008. During the telephonic interview, the Article 34 Amendments, drawing objections, and 35 U.S.C. § 112 claim rejections were discussed. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner agreed that the specification adequately describes the drawings. The Examiner also agreed with the proposal to amend the specification. Therefore, the patent application should be in condition for allowance. The arguments presented during the telephonic interview are reproduced below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8, 16 – 17, and 24 – 29 are allowed over the prior art of record.

The Examiner indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action (Office Action dated February 4, 2008; page 5).

The Examiner also indicated that claims 2, 4 – 7, 15, and 18 – 22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (Office Action dated February 4, 2008; page 5).

Article 34

The Examiner indicated that Applicants are required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application. The Examiner indicated that he would like to know if the current claims being examined are the same as or nearly the same as those submitted with the Article 34 amendments.

On August 1, 2006, Applicant submitted a translation of the originally filed PCT application (with claims) and a translation of pertinent portions of PCT/IPEA/409 dated June 13, 2006 ("IPEA document"). As shown on page 3 of the IPEA document, the subject matter set forth in claims 1 – 22 of the originally filed PCT application were novel and had inventive step.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, the Examiner wanted to ensure that a translation of the original PCT application and IPEA document were filed with the USPTO. The Examiner generally agreed that documents submitted on August 1, 2006 were sufficient to show that the current claims being examined are the same as or nearly the same as those submitted with the Article 34 amendments.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because "the examiner is not sure why the five arrows are shown in figure 1. At first glance the arrows would seem to be indicating that the screws 8a-8f is received into the clamps 5a-5f. The examiner is pretty sure from reading the specification that this is not the case" (Office Action dated February 4, 2008; page 3).

Paragraph [0028] of the Substitute Specification describes the arrows in Figure 1. After reading paragraph [0028], the Examiner agreed that the specification adequately describes the arrows in Figure 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 7, 15 – 17, and 18 – 22 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated: “there are numerous instances where a claimed term is called something completely different depending on which embodiment you’re studying. For example, “clamping devices 5a...5g” in paragraph 23 is called clamping devices, spring clips, and screw terminals in paragraph[,] for example[,] 25” (Office Action dated February 4, 2008; page 4).


During the telephonic interview, the Examiner generally agreed to withdraw the § 112 claim rejections if the terms “clamping devices” and “transformer” were clarified in the specification. As set forth above, the specification was amended as requested by the Examiner. Therefore, claims 1 – 2, 4 – 7, 15 – 17, and 18 – 22 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,


Jay Q. Knobloch
Reg. No. 57,347
Agent for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200